



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the analogy of the power of a court of superior jurisdiction to determine finally for the parties that the case arising is within its power to decide.

The plan of submission to a Joint High Commission, composed of three citizens or subjects of one party and the same number of another, is a concession to the fear of being too tightly bound to an adverse decision made manifest in the objections of the Senate committee, because it may well be supposed that two out of three citizens or subjects of one party would not decide that an issue was arbitrable under the treaty against the contention of their own country unless it were reasonably clear that the issue was justiciable under the first clause of the treaty.

From His Address at the Capitol, Sacramento, California.

We have heard a great deal during the past six months in favor of general arbitration treaties for the promotion of the peace of the world. I believe there has been of late more genuine expression of sentiment among all the people of the earth for peace than ever before in the world's history. The craving for some effective means of promoting peace grows not so much out of actual war as out of the desperation with which the great nations are increasing the stupendous burden of armies and armament, making Europe an armed camp, with the growing menace of bankruptcy.

The fact is that we have had very little war in the last twenty-five years, and one of the reasons has been the rivalry in preparation for war and the certainty of financial disaster to some nations which must follow.

Among these great nations there is the conservatism of domestic stability and the law-abiding character of the population. Universal treaties of arbitration for such countries are of the highest importance as probably furnishing a means by which all may be induced ultimately to reduce their armaments, when it shall become apparent that arbitration is a real and practical substitute for war.

Support President Taft's Arbitration Treaties.

By His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons.

Address delivered at the opening of the Baltimore Peace Congress, May 3, 1911.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall make my remarks, ladies and gentlemen, as brief as possible, as I do not wish to detain the honored President of the United States, who is soon going to address you. I was requested to offer a prayer at the opening of this great convention of peace, but I regard a specific invocation quite unnecessary, inasmuch as I am satisfied that all the addresses that shall be made from this place today will be prayers for peace.

I assume that the purpose of this great and distinguished gathering is to create, to promote closer and more friendly relations between the United States and Great Britain, and I am firmly persuaded that a treaty of arbitration between England and the United States would be not only a source of infinite blessings to both of the nations concerned, but also will prepare the way for enduring peace throughout the whole world. There are many reasons why there should be a closer alliance between England and the United States. We speak the

same noble language—a language, by the way, which today is more generally employed than any tongue in the civilized world. Not only do we speak that same tongue, but we also enjoy the same literature; the classic literature of England is ours, from Chaucer down to Newman, and the classic literature of the United States is claimed also by England. The literature of both countries is a common heritage to both.

Again, we are living practically under the same form of government. The head of our nation is the honored President before us. The head of England is the King. We are ruled by a constitutional republic; England is ruled by a constitutional monarchy, and I venture to say, without any disparagement whatever of other nations, that England and the United States have been more happy in reconciling and in adjusting legitimate authority with personal individual liberty than any other nations on the face of the earth.

We all know the vast dominions of the British Empire. England's empire embraces about ten million square miles, or about one-fifth of the surface of the globe. Great was the extent of the Roman Empire in the days of the imperial Cæsars. The Empire of Rome extended into Europe as far as the river Danube; it extended into Asia as far as the Tigris and the Euphrates, and into Africa as far as Mauretania. And yet the extent of the Roman Empire was scarcely one-sixth of that of the British Empire of today.

Daniel Webster, the great statesman, about sixty years ago made a speech in the United States Senate in which he thus described the vast extent of the British Empire: "She has dotted the whole surface of the earth with her possessions and military forces, whose morning drum-beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, encircles the whole earth with one unbroken strain of the martial airs of England."

The United States today houses one hundred millions of happy and contented people, and our nation, our government, exercises a certain dominant, but still more a very salutary, influence on the many republics of America that are south of us. We all know that its influence is not to destroy, but to save. This influence is not to dismember, but the aid of our President is always with the cause of peace and righteous economy.

Oh, my friends, how happy will the day be when these two great nations unite in the cause of permanent friendship.

We are told in Holy Scriptures that when the waters receded from the earth, in the time of Noah, Almighty God made a solemn covenant with the Patriarch and his posterity that from that time forth never again would this earth of ours be deluged by water, and as a sign, as a symbol, as an evidence of this covenant which He made, He caused an arc—a rainbow—to appear in the heavens. Let Britannia and Columbia join hands across the Atlantic, and their outstretched arms will form a sacred arc—a sacred rainbow—of peace, that will excite the admiration of the world, and will proclaim to mankind that with God's help nevermore again shall this earth of ours be deluged with blood shed in fratricidal war. (Applause.)

I am sure that the time is most auspicious for the consummation of this great event. It sees us start with the help of one whom we all honor, the President of the United States, who brings to its support his own strong

personality and also the influence of his official position. I trust also that it will meet with the endorsement of our Congress. We know that it receives the encouragement of Sir Edward Grey, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of England.

Looking around me here, I see that we have many distinguished men sent upon the same glorious mission. They come to uphold the hands of the President in this mission just as the people of Israel upheld the arms of Moses when he addressed them.

I pray that all you gentlemen who are participating in this glorious work will deserve to receive that title bestowed upon the friends of peace by the Prince of Peace, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

The Result of the Arbitration Treaty.

By Andrew Carnegie.

From the Contemporary Review, August, 1911.

As long as nations retain the right to determine for themselves what pertains to their honor or vital interests, there is and can be no security against war, and, what is far more destructive than war itself, the constant, ever-pressing danger of war. It is this, and not actual war, which ominously overhangs the world as a cloud threatening to burst and devastate the earth. Generations of men live and die in our age during prolonged years of peace, but from the cradle to the grave not one escapes the ever-present, appalling danger of war. In our day one nation prepares against this ever-threatening danger, and other nations inevitably follow, every nation truly proclaiming that its action is solely defensive—as indeed we may justly believe it is intended to be—and yet the result is that preparation begets preparation, thus increasing the danger it is fondly expected to lessen. Last year our republic spent seventy per cent of its total revenue upon war and war pensions, and yet it is of all the great nations the least desirous of war, being without territorial ambitions, and earnestly desirous of living at peace with all. Britain's cost per head was even greater.

It was this alarming condition of affairs which drove President Taft to reconsider seriously the problem of peaceful arbitration, which had so far failed. He had no difficulty in discovering the cause, and the sole cause, of this, and therefore stated that all questions should be submitted to arbitration.

The complete result of our arbitration treaty we fondly but undoubtingly anticipate may require time. Possibly the next generation may be the first fully to realize its fruition; but come it must, even if our race alone be left at present to set the example. But let us enlarge our view and assume for the moment that the three other nations with which our republic is today negotiating in Washington, at their request, should decide to join us in the treaty which provides that all disputes be peaceably settled. We should then have not only the English-speaking race, but the entire Teutonic race as well, Germany being the root and our two lands the branches; in addition, France and Holland, one once the foremost power upon the land and the other once foremost upon the sea.

Imagine these lands unitedly informing the world of

their brotherly and peaceful action, and expressing the ardent hope that their neighbors shall consider the propriety of joining in the movement for international peace! That some of the other powers would join is certain. Let us suppose that a dispute arose between two powers, and war was feared, the friendly appeal of the peaceful powers to the contestants to arbitrate could scarcely be resisted; but if it were, the peaceful powers might then intimate that as all nations are concerned as partners in the peace of the world, they have rights which should not be ignored, and, if they were, it might be found necessary for them to declare non-intercourse with the offender who disturbed that peace.

The World's Two Vicious Circles.

By Professor William I. Hull.

The fallacy of *petitio principii*, familiarly known as "begging the question" or "arguing in a circle," is so frequently met with in logic and in real life that one might suppose that responsible statesmen would have long ago learned to avoid it both in their mental processes and in their political activities. But, like Banquo's ghost, it is difficult to lay, and it still haunts the world in this twentieth century of enlightenment and frightens it into particularly pernicious sins of omission and commission.

These sins are most flagrant, perhaps, when the world attempts to regulate its international relations. For example, each nation argues that it can protect its own peace only or best by increasing its armaments; and accordingly each of the circle of forty-odd nations is feverishly engaged in the edifying task of out-arming, to the best of its abilities, each of the others. Great Britain, assured that her own peace and the peace of the world is threatened by the menace of the Teuton, lays down the keels of two dreadnaughts; Germany, perceiving the portentous shadow of the advancing Briton, lays down the keels of two super-dreadnaughts. This gives to Great Britain a realizing sense of the inadequacy of her twenty-eight miles of warships, and in order to avoid another panic such as the German super-dreadnaughts caused her, she increases her per capita naval expenditures within ten years by 43 per cent; Germany "goes her several better," and increases her per capita naval expenditures within ten years by 119 per cent. Some American "statesmen" dream of the menace of Germany in South America or of Japan upon the Pacific, and the United States, frightened by such nightmares, increases its per capita naval expenditures within ten years by 64 per cent. Japan, emulating its Occidental school teachers in their fallacious logic, and postulating the impossibility of having too much of a good thing, increases its per capita naval expenditures within ten years by 137 per cent. The other four "great powers," caught up in the same frenzy of fallacious logic and futile competition, convert their national resources into dreadnaughts, and all eight together expend upon their navies within ten years the almost unimaginable sum of \$5,600,000,000! (These figures are taken from the British Admiralty's "White Paper" of October, 1911.)

Thus the vicious circle is formed; the small members of the family of nations join in the frenzied competi-